

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Official Action dated March 6, 2006, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 9-12, 27, 29, 32, 33, 42, 44-48, 50, 51 and 53-59 are now pending in the application, with Claims 42, 46 and 57 being independent. Claims 1, 28, 31, 38, 43, 49 and 52 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and Claims 3, 4, 7, 9-12, 27, 29, 32, 33, 42, 44-48, 50, 51 and 53-57 have been amended herein. Claims 58 and 59 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. The changes to the claims have not been made for any reasons related to patentability, but rather to clarify the scope of the claims. Support for the claim changes can be found in the original specification. For example, the displaying step is supported at least at page 5, lines 10-22. Of course, the claims are not intended to be limited to these preferred embodiments.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9-12, 27-29, 31, 38 and 42-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab et al. '182 in view of Savitzky et al. '083. Claims 32 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nehab et al. in view of Savitzky et al., and further in view of Hayashi et al. '996.

Applicants once more submit that the pending claims are patentable over the citations of record. Nehab et al. and Savitzky et al. have been further reviewed, but are not believed to disclose or suggest the invention as claimed. For example, in Nehab et al. after all URLs are stored in a container 72 and after a printing instruction is input, the formatting step is invoked (column 10, lines 13-20). With regard to Claims 42, 46 and 57, for example, Nehab et al. does not disclose or suggest detecting whether a compiled list is updated due to an access of a second application, or, in response to detecting that the compiled list is updated, fetching the plurality of accessed documents in the compiled list (or each selected hyper-text document) and formatting the fetched and updated documents into a printable document. Nor does Nehab et al. disclose or suggest displaying the printable document in a print preview display to represent a document which includes pages printable by a printer output device, with the print preview display being generated in accordance with changes to print settings of the printer output device, as is further recited in independent Claims 42, 46 and 57. None of the other citations, whether taken individually or in combination, are believed to remedy such deficiencies. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections are requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Appln. No.: 08/903,743

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark A. Williamson", written over a horizontal line.

Mark A. Williamson  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

MAW:mm

DC\_MAIN 242793v1